

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

## Minutes of Meeting March 16-17, 2000

California Department of Education  
721 Capitol Mall, State Board Room 166  
Sacramento, California 95814

### 1. Full Curriculum Commission Meeting, Thursday, March 16, 2000

#### Curriculum Commissioners--Present:

Marilyn Astore, Chair  
Catherine Banker  
Viken Hovsepian  
Janet Philiposian  
Leslie Schwarze  
Susan Stickel

Patrice Abarca, Vice Chair  
Mary Coronado Calvario  
Veronica Norris  
Richard Schwartz  
Barbara Smith (present for portions of the meeting)  
Karen Yamamoto

#### Commissioners--Absent:

Roy Anthony \*  
Lora Griffin \*  
Dede Alpert, Member of the Senate

Ken Dotson \*  
Joseph Nation \*  
Jack Scott, Member of the Assembly

#### State Board of Education Liaison—Absent:

Marion Joseph

#### California Department of Education Staff:

Sherry Skelly Griffith, Executive Secretary for the Curriculum Commission  
Suzanne Rios, Acting Administrator, Instructional Resources Unit, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division (CFIR)  
Thomas Adams, Consultant, CFIR  
Judith Brown, Consultant, CFIR  
Rona Gordon, Consultant, CFIR  
Deborah Keys, Consultant, CFIR  
Nancy Brynson, Consultant, CFIR  
Beverly Cole, Office Technician, CFIR  
Sandi Adams-Jones, Staff Service Manager I  
Kristina Travers, Office Technician, CFIR

A. Call to Order. Commissioner Astore, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.

B. Salute to the Flag. Commissioner Viken Hovsepian led the Commissioners, staff, and the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance

C. Review of Agenda, Report of Chair of Curriculum Commission (and State Board Actions)  
Commission Chair Astore reviewed the agenda for the meeting. She asked that all Commissioners make every effort to be present for the entire meeting in order to ensure a quorum for all actions taken. Chair Astore called attention to the February and March Commission letters to the State Board President. Chair Astore asked Vice Chair Abarca to report on the SBE response to the Commission report that Ms. Abarca had made on March 9 in Los Angeles. Commissioner Abarca reported that the SBE took final action on the Science 2000 Adoption. She also reported that the Board recommended a question and answer paper be developed by the Commission, CDE, and the SBE, regarding English Language Development (ELD) materials to ensure information is available to the public regarding the 2002 English-Language Arts/English Language Development adoption. She said that the SBE asked that

\* *Absent for Cause* notification made to Commission Chair

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

more media participation be pursued, including the Spanish media services, to create greater outreach to parents.

Commissioner Abarca also reported that the SBE discussed and expressed interest in the Commission's request for the Board to consider recommending policy language to increase funding for classroom libraries from K-4 to K-12. The State Board (SBE) approved the Commission's recommendations for Mathematics Instructional Materials Adoption Panels (IMAPs) and the Content Review Panels (CRPs) for the forthcoming mathematics adoption; however, the approval by the SBE is contingent upon legal review by the Board Legal Counsel of nine applicants who had identified possible conflicts of interest. The SBE directed CFIR staff to continue the outreach for additional candidates for the Instructional Materials Adoption Panels (IMAPs) and the Content Review Panels (CRPs) and to present additional candidates no later than the May SBE meeting. The SBE also directed the Commission to review their prior findings of CRP candidates and clarify why any panelists were disqualified.

The Board approved six additional CRP members for History-Social Science; an additional candidate will be reviewed by the Commission and will be presented to the Board in April.

The Science 2000 Adoption was presented to the SBE with six recommended programs, all of which were approved by the State Board. Commissioner Abarca reported that the SBE gave direction to the staff to develop draft policy/guidelines for programs not on the state approved list if a district could show close alignment to standards and achievement results.

Commissioner Abarca shared with the Commission the comments of appreciation expressed by departing Board President, Robert Trigg, especially in light of their countless hours of volunteering to serve on the Commission while carrying "real" jobs in education.

The Board also sent praise to the Commission for the briefing for publishers on the criteria for the Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Adoption. Chair Astore shared correspondence from Kathryn Dronenburg that expressed her gratitude for the Commission's good wishes.

## D. Correspondence/Requests from the State Board of Education (SBE).

Executive Secretary Griffith shared correspondence from the State Board to Dr. Rollie Otto for his outstanding work with the Curriculum Commission on a number of special science projects as well as his work with the CDE Standards and Assessment Division. Chair Astore indicated there were no other items at this time.

## E. Executive Secretary Report--Sherry S. Griffith, Exec. Secretary, Curriculum Commission

Ms. Griffith reviewed the names of the new State Board officers and members (Monica Lozano, President, and Susan Hammer, Vice President). She described plans being made in collaboration with Commissioner Banker, for a celebration dinner for the retiring board members in recognition of their fine work. Commissioner Banker offered to help coordinate the event for the evening of May 18.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Ms. Griffith shared a summary of activities in the development of the High School Exit Exam. She reported that she has asked CFIR staff to regularly attend the advisory group meetings. She also offered to request an update from the Standards and Assessment Division soon

Ms. Griffith distributed a new publication from the Proposition 227 Task Force, Educating English Learners for 21<sup>st</sup> Century (CDE Press [www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov)). She called attention to the guiding principles found in the document that relate to the work of the Commission--the availability of strong core curriculum, current instructional materials, and curriculum frameworks--and strong support for the building of literacy skills for English language learners. The principles are supported within the new frameworks for language arts and math. She offered to schedule further discussion on the findings of the task force, if the Commission wishes.

Ms. Griffith briefly referenced the work on the Governor's budget and offered to provide information on related legislation, as well as information on additional revenues that may be available to schools at the next meeting. Ms. Griffith invited Commissioners to share their ideas about how to enhance the distribution of frameworks to the field.

Ms. Griffith described personnel changes occurring within the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources (CFIR) Division. She invited Commissioners to invite content experts in the field to apply as Visiting Educators in support of the Commission work. Chair Astore commended the director and the CFIR staff, stating that the work of the CFIR office is so important, as well as necessary, in order for the Commission to accomplish the requirements of adoptions and frameworks.

Ms. Griffith also highlighted the status of education-related legislation during this spring and offered an update by mail regarding key legislation of interest to the Commissioners. She also reported on staff activity based on the Board's direction to develop draft procedures for dealing with corrections/omissions in adopted materials after their adoption by the Board; she reminded the Commissioners that discussion by the whole commission on these matters would follow.

## F. Approval of Minutes of Minutes of the January 2000 Meeting.

Commissioner Abarca requested an array of specific changes in the minutes to formally reference the Commissioners. Commissioner Norris discussed the need to expand the record of the discussion in January about how to establish an expectation for formal notification by publishers of corrections found after the State Board adopts materials. A discussion ensued after Commissioner Hovsepian requested a clarification of how absences are noted in the record for those Commissioners who follow the Commission procedure to notify the Commission Chair of a justifiable absence in advance of a meeting. Chair Astore encouraged all Commissioners to recognize their role as both an honor and an obligation in a very serious endeavor. Commission Coronado discussed her concern for early departures which make it difficult to take action with the required quorum. At Commissioner Norris' recommendation, consensus was made to record in the minutes those absentees who had notified the Chair about their unavoidable "absence for cause." Ms. Griffith offered to draft a letter from Chair Astore reminding the whole Commission that if a person will be unavoidably absent, each will need to notify the Chair. Commission Schwartz moved that the minutes be approved with the recommended corrections and additions as discussed; Commissioner Norris seconded the motion; the vote of "ayes" was unanimous.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

## F. Academic Performance Index (API) – Briefing: Pat McCabe, Administrator, Office of Policy and Evaluation, Education Planning and Information Center, CDE

Ms. Griffith introduced Pat McCabe, CDE, who provided background and forthcoming details of the development of the Academic Performance Index (API) established for California Public schools. The API is a required part of the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA). He provided detailed support materials and explanations to the Commissioners regarding the API calculations, the designated levels of performance for the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP), and the incentive program, all of which may relate to situations in which the Commissioners are confronted. He encouraged the Commissioners to refer questions about the accountability measures to his office (916-657-3740) and to frequent the web site for the PSAA (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/psaa>).

## H. Report of the State Board of Education Executive Director

SBE Executive Director John Mockler discussed recent actions by the State Board related to the Commission and reviewed the Board priorities for this year. Their priorities are in continued alignment with the Governor's education goals and further development of a standards-based accountability system for public education.

Commissioner Schwartz asked Mr. Mockler about the direction to be taken by the California Subject Matter Projects, based on the January report by Board Member Joseph. Commissioner Schwartz referenced the minutes for Ms. Joseph's description of the Governor's request to the California Subject Matter Projects (CSMP) to connect their professional development services to standards-based instructional resources adopted by the State Board. He asked for clarification about the formality of that direction. Mr. Mockler said the Governor is eager to see alignment with standards in all levels of the educational support system as we build a standards-based system.

Mr. Mockler thanked the Commissioners for their tremendous efforts. He spoke of the high regard that outgoing President Trigg held for the Commission's efforts to advise the Board on curricular issues.

At 12:15 p.m. Vice Chair Abarca thanked Mr. Mockler for his presentation and the care with which he answered questions from the Commissioners. She recessed the Commission for lunch.

Vice Chair Abarca called the Commission to order at 1:05 p.m. (Chair Astore returned 1:20.)

## I. Change/Corrections/Edits Process

For this item, Ms. Griffith referenced the memorandum outlining a proposed process and timeline recommended in consultation with the Executive Director of the State Board of Education, John Mockler. The "change/corrections/edits policy" proposal adoptions includes the following activities: convening a workgroup including input from the major stakeholders involved with the policy; providing input during the current Commission meeting; presenting the information to the Executive Committee during a scheduled meeting in April or May; the

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Executive Committee then presenting recommendations to the Commission during the May meeting and reporting to the State Board in June.

Secretary Griffith explained that the guiding statutory and regulatory provisions are the SBE approved grade level content standards, SBE approved curriculum frameworks and criteria. Examples of guidelines that were presented during the Commission discussion included:

“Corrections/Edits” need to be clear and easily discerned by the publisher, Curriculum Commissioner(s), and Department of Education staff. Examples are: inexact language and imprecise definitions, mistaken notations, mislabeling of pictures and objects, and misspellings.

“Changes” means adding new content and requires judgement of a commissioner, CRP and IMAP members to determine whether a publisher's changes will align a program with the criteria and standards, all of which takes additional review sessions, change meetings, and commitment by IMAPs, CRPs, Commissioners and Department staff. “Changes” would need to include: revising the program to meet the criteria and standards; rewriting of a chapter or section; adding new content; moving materials from one grade level to another.

Chair Astore asked for input from the full commission. Commissioner Norris requested that the reference needs to say something about incorrect data in the language, including definitions, notations in science, and data within texts that is incorrect. Commissioner Schwarz suggested such incorrect data would need to go under changes as opposed to edits, since corrections/edits are easily seen and confirmed by anyone. Changes to content needed, including references to data that are actually incorrect, would go under “changes.” Commissioner Stickel said “corrections/edits” are misspelled words. It is important to account for accuracy of data and content, and it is important to give equity to numeracy as well as literacy.

Commission Banker requested that the information provided to IMAPs and Commissioners be consistent. This is to ensure that all participants have an understanding of what “changes” were. This would ensure that others do not interpret it differently. Commission Schwartz stated that the criterion requiring coverage of all standards would help ensure accuracy at the time of presentation and would not encourage publishers to think it is allowable to submit complete programs and deal with small edits later.

Commission Stickel moved to recommend the acceptance of the proposed procedure for establishing a policy as laid out in the memorandum with the additional recommendations made today. Commissioner Abarca seconded. The Commission voted all “ayes.”

## J. Errata Process for Publishers—Post-Adoption.

Chair Astore called attention to the memorandum within the agenda packet describing issues involved with the development of an errata policy for publishers. The State Board discussed this in February, at the Commission’s request. An array of questions was presented for the Commission’s consideration regarding the implementation of such a policy. Ms. Griffith reported that CFIR staff members are researching how other states ensure that public schools are notified regarding errors found in adopted instructional materials. Preliminary results from the survey of other states suggest that the development of such a policy for California will be on the

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

cutting edge. Ms. Griffith reported that the American Association of Publishers has agreed to also participate in the development of an errata policy.

Among the issues to consider in the development of an errata process are: compliance to the policy, the expectations for second editions, and procedures already used by some publishers. Chair Astore asked for input from the members. A discussion ensued which included Commissioner Norris' suggestion of several issues to consider within this policy. (1) if errors are found post-publication, get information out to the districts using the product immediately; (2) what happens afterwards will require some mechanism to ascertain that corrections are actually being used in the classrooms because going to a district means almost nothing.

Commissioner Banker stated that this is a powerful reason to go to online texts to access or print on site; she asked that publishers to move to licensing as opposed to selling books.

Commissioner Schwarz suggested that the errata be posted on the CDE website with adoptions.

Chair Astore asked for a motion to have a workgroup meet and develop a draft on an errata policy to present to the State Board and the Commission according to the timeline recommended. Commissioner Norris so moved and Commissioner Hovsepian seconded the motion. The Commissioners all voiced "aye."

K. Other Matters/ Audience Comment. No comments came from the audience.

Commission Chair Abarca (Chair Astore had left the room) recessed the full commission at 1:38 p.m. She recommended that all Commissioners remain present during the meeting.

## 2. Executive Committee.

Present: Marilyn Astore, Chair; Patrice Abarca, Vice Chair; Sue Stickel, Catherine Banker

Absent: Ken Dotson \*

Staff: Sherry Skelly Griffith, Executive Secretary; Judith Brown, Consultant, CFIR

Vice Chair Abarca called the Executive Committee to order at 1:42 p.m. (Chair Astore returned to the room soon after.) Commissioner Stickel recommended continued practice of using the nameplates as indicators of subcommittee membership for each part of the agenda while others listen in on the committee discussion.

### A. Final Review of Commission Goals 2000.

Chair Astore asked Ms. Griffith and Ms. Brown to discuss the draft document of Commission goals developed in November and January. Ms. Brown asked for direction from the Executive Committee regarding how to present the Commission goals for public access. The draft listed priority projects for adoptions and frameworks. Commissioner Stickel recommended that the full set of the goals be approved and to preface the listing of subject matter committee goals with an introductory summary of major projects in frameworks and adoptions. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. All members said "aye." The Commission goals are available to the public on the Department of Education web site ([www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov)) under "Curriculum and Instructional Resources"

### B. Commission Voting Rights for Adoptions

\* *Absent for Cause* notification made to Commission Chair

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

In response to a question raised in January about a policy or procedure to guide voting rights for adoptions for Commissioners who were not involved with the adoption process, Director Griffith reported on findings of the Legal Counsel.

Each member has full voting rights for any matter that comes before the Commission regardless of length of term or involvement in the adoption. There is to be no distinction in voting rights which the Commission can make on any members of the body even if not particularly involved in adoption. Chair Astore stated hope for a commitment from Commissioners to follow good judgment in preparation for the voting. Commission Banker indicated a desire for all Commissioners to prepare and to participate fully to ensure a quorum is available for the voting. Commission Abarca stated a hope that action on future adoptions be taken before new Commissioners join the membership. Ms. Griffith stated that the State Board had acted to extend the terms of the SBE appointees to ensure their involvement in the 2001 and 2002 core adoptions in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics. Those SBE appointments will be then be filled in January after the Commission actions on the adoption recommendations. The Board directed the staff to work with the other appointing bodies to align the appointment terms.

## C. Errata Process for Publishers – Post-Adoption

This had been dealt with earlier by the decision of the full Commission to request a report in May from a collaborative workgroup.

## D. Multi-year Calendar Discussion on this item was postponed.

## E. Appointment: Non-voting member for AB598 Advisory Commission

Executive Secretary Griffith referred to AB 598, which establishes a Commission on Technology and Learning and requires the Curriculum Commission to appoint one non-voting member. The Committee on Technology Learning is to convene in April. The Curriculum Commission is to work with this new Committee to develop guidelines and criteria in preparation of a three-year technology plan. Chair Astore asked for nominations. Commissioner Abarca nominated Commissioner Banker; Commissioner Stickel seconded the motion; Ms. Banker was selected. Chair Astore stated the Commission is grateful for her technological expertise and contributions.

## F. Other Matters/Audience Comment

Chair Astore reported that Commissioner Banker has an opportunity to attend a conference in Canada on universal access with technology in education, which will contribute to the work of the Electronic Learning Resources and her work with the new Commission on Technology and Education. Ms. Banker reported on her previous work with the Center for Exceptional Children to develop technology guidelines for implementing universal access. Commissioner Stickel made the motion in support and Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion to support the costs.

Chair Astore asked Ms. Griffith to introduce the memo that had been prepared for VPA (Item 2G) regarding the concern for overlap adoptions over the next two years—the core adoptions in mathematics and reading/language arts, as well as follow-up adoptions in 2001 for visual and performing arts, science and history-social science. Ms. Griffith walked through the item, which highlighted the major workload issues. Ms. Griffith reviewed the options:

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

1. Leave the schedules as they are.
2. Move the follow-up adoptions for History-Social Science, Science, and Visual and Performing Arts to 2002, after adopted materials for Reading/Language Arts, which will be finalized in January 2002.
3. Survey publishers in a year to determine if there is still interest in a follow-up adoption. If no interest is indicated, take the results to the Board to report lack of interest.

Executive Secretary Griffith called attention to the survey results from publishers in which most of them reported if they were to participate they would participate in any given year. After further discussion Commissioner Banker moved to approve Option 2, stating there seems to be no complaint in postponing the adoptions. Ms. Griffith encouraged the publishers to continue to report to the CFIR office regarding their concerns for the proposed timeline changes. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion and Chair Astore confirmed that all were in consensus with recommending Option 2.

Vik Hovsepien raised concerns that actions from subject matter committees may sometimes call for other Commissioners to accept a decision of committee and not abstain from voting. Chair Astore assured that abstaining does not mean, "I do not care" but indicates the Commissioner has some concern. Commissioners Yamamoto and Norris confirmed this with their explanations of prior instances when each had abstained in a vote.

There were no other matters raised from the audience and the committee was adjourned.

### **3. Visual and Performing Arts (VPA) Subject Matter Committee**

Present: Karen Yamamoto, Vice Chair; Mary Coronado, Janet Philibosian, Sue Stickel  
Absent: Roy Anthony\*, Chair; Lora Griffin\*  
Staff: Judi Brown, CFIR

Commissioner Yamamoto, Vice Chair, called the VPA meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

#### **A. Adoption Timeline and Publisher Survey - (Information)**

Commissioner Yamamoto expressed satisfaction that the preparation for the next VPA adoption will be more successful since the Executive Committee moved the VPA adoption to 2002.

Commissioner Philibosian thanked the Executive committee for changing the timeline since she is involved with three of the SMCs scheduled for adoptions. She stated that she teaches in a year-round school that is in session during the training and deliberation work time.

#### **B. VPA Standards**

Vice Chair Yamamoto reviewed a written update based on information from Patty Taylor, CDE Consultant for Visual and Performing Arts. Ms. Brown indicated that Ms. Taylor has offered to present an update at the May meeting to summarize recent efforts surrounding the development of voluntary standards for VPA.

#### **C. Update on Summit Meeting/Arts Task Force**

No formal update was made. Ms. Brown referred the new members of the Commission to the Task Force report that is presented on the CDE website ([www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov)) and within the Standards and Assessment Division section.

\* *Absent for Cause* notification made to Commission Chair



# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

## D. Other Matters/Audience Comment.

No other issues were presented; the committee was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

## 4. Science Subject Matter Committee, March 16, 2000

Present: Richard Schwartz, Chair; Catherine Banker, Vice-Chair;  
Vik Hovsepian, Veronica Norris

Absent: Joe Nation\*, Barbara Smith\*, Ken Dotson\*

CDE Staff: Rona Griffith, Consultant

### A. Presentation of Draft Science Framework

Richard Schwartz, Chair of the Science Subject Matter Committee, called the Science Subject Matter Committee to order at 2:25 p.m. He introduced Mike Rios, Chair of the Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee (CFCC). Mike introduced Lynda Rogers and Dick Berry, committee members and editors of the draft framework, Rollie Otto, overall framework writer, and Rona Gordon, CDE staff to the CFCC. Other CFCC members present in the audience included Rick Norman, Hanna Hoffman and Charles Munger.

Mike Rios presented an overview of the March 2000 version of the draft Science Framework. The content standards covered in Chapter 3 provide the centerpiece. The supporting chapters inform and help teachers implement an effective science program based on the standards. Mike briefly reviewed the content of each chapter as outlined in the Table of Contents:

Chapter 1: A Science Education Program for all California Students identifies essential components of an effective science program based on the standards.

Chapter 2: Standards-Based Education explains the benefits of using content standards to guide students toward desired outcomes.

Chapter 3: California Science Content Standards: Teaching the Content explains in detail the science of the K-12 content standards and highlights conceptual connections between grade levels.

Chapter 4: Assessment Strategies describes the variety of strategies that can be used to assess student learning in science aligned to the standards.

Chapter 5: The Nature of Science provides an in-depth discussion on the nature of science, its process, and relationship to technology.

Chapter 6: Socially Sensitive Issues helps teachers address socially relevant issues in their science classrooms that stem directly from the science content, but often go beyond the specificity of the standards.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Chapter 7: Universal Access promotes equal access for all students to learn science by recognizing individual and cultural differences and overcoming gender and ethnic equality issues.

Chapter 8: Professional Development describes the importance of providing teachers with ongoing professional development opportunities to become better skilled as science teachers.

Chapter 9: Teaching with Technology describes the inherent connection between technology and science and the importance of integrating technology into the science curriculum.

Chapter 10: Making Connections Across the Curriculum provides connections among science, reading/language arts, and mathematics standards at appropriate places in the curriculum.

Chapter 11: Criteria for Evaluating K-8 Science Instructional Materials informs school districts and teachers about the criteria used in the 2000 state adoption of science instructional materials.

Following Mr. Rios' overview, Dr. Berry described the process used to edit the content chapter, middle and high school grades. An overall format and structure gave the document a uniform appearance and promoted continuity of writing. Accuracy of content was the highest priority. The content chapter is directed toward the new or newly reassigned teacher, to support the science standards while facilitating standards-based teaching strategies.

Dr. Berry shared the criteria used for editing the content chapter: 1) adherence to direction from the CFCC, 2) scientific accuracy, 3) language considerations – reduce redundancies, eliminate personal agendas, don't introduce 'new' standards and avoid writing a 'textbook', apply common style and format. The organization of the content followed a consistent format: 1) investigation and experimentation, 2) background, 3) text of the standards, 4) description of the standards, 5) suggested instructional strategies, 6) guiding indicators.

Lynda Rogers commented on the K-5 content sections. The writing of K-5 materials reflected representation of the entire CFCC (content experts and elementary teachers). The audience for K-5 is the multiple subject (interdisciplinary) classroom teacher. Ms. Rogers referred to one of the appendices, which presents the standards "at a glance," while highlighting unifying concepts and connections across grade levels. Chapter 10, Making Connections Across the Curriculum, links related science, reading/language arts and mathematics standards.

Dr. Rollie Otto, the framework writer, congratulated the CFCC on its work. He stated that the framework is consistent with the original intent of the Academic Standards Commission. The supporting chapters address key issues science educators will face in teaching the content standards. Several chapters were supported from focus group sessions with academic content experts who offered a broad and quality perspective on the topic. The CFCC was a very professional and collegial committee.

Mr. Rios concluded the Framework presentation with final comments and recommendations. The CFCC endorses goals for high school assessment in science that align state tests with standards-based curricula, and strongly recommends state testing of science content standards in

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

grades 5 and 8. The CFCC encourages posting of the draft framework on the CDE web site as soon as possible. Mr. Rios conveyed his thanks and appreciation to CDE staff, his fellow CFCC members, and the Curriculum Commission.

## B. Public Hearing: Draft Science Framework

Earl Boynton spoke in favor of eliminating Chapters 5 and 6 from the Framework on the basis that they are not necessary and present information covered in other areas. Joseph Mastropaolo spoke in favor of eliminating the topic of evolution, which he asserted is based on falsehoods, from the Science Framework.

Commission Discussion: Chair Astore, Commissioner Schwartz, Chair of the Science Subject Matter Committee, and Commissioners Banker, Hovsepian, and Norris, offered congratulations and expressed appreciation for the high quality of work by the CFCC. Mr. Rios affirmed that the CFCC as a whole had ratified and endorsed both the content and supporting chapters, with recommended edits, at its February meeting. Dr. Adams, Consultant, CFIR, stated that the criteria developed by the CFCC contributed to the success of the science adoption; he also commended the CFCC members who had participated as IMAP/CRP members in the adoption.

Rona Gordon, staff to the Science CFCC, outlined the next steps in the process. The March 2000 version of the draft framework will be finalized, with some technical edits and addition of appendices, and presented to the Curriculum Commission at its May meeting to approve for the field review, which will be conducted from June – October, 2000. The results of the field review will be brought back to the Commission in November 2000.

## C. Science Testing Grades 9-12 Update

Executive Secretary Griffith provided an update on the status of the Science Augmentation Test in Grades 9-12. A list of recommended panelists is being developed to participate in formulating integrated/coordinated tests to be derived from the existing pool of discipline-based questions that are currently being field-tested. These suggested individuals are experts in developing integrated/coordinated science curriculum. The Science CFCC will provide input on the proposed panel, and once approved, the panel will work with the CDE Assessment Division and Harcourt Educational Measurement to develop four integrated/coordinated tests aligned with content standards for the high school disciplines.

## 5. Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| Present:   | Leslie Schwarze, Chair; Mary Coronado, Vice Chair; Patrice Abarca, Susan Stickel |
| Absent:    | Joe Nation*  |
| CDE Staff: | Nancy Brynelson, Arleen Burns  |
| Others:    | Julian Randolph, Writer; Hal Wingard, Calif. Language Teachers Assoc.            |

Commissioner Schwarze called the Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee at 3:55 p.m.

## A. Framework Revision

1. National Standards and ACTFL Performance Guidelines.

\* *Absent for Cause* notification made to Commission Chair

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

The group reviewed and discussed two documents: the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (national standards) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) *Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners*. Both documents had been distributed previously to the SMC members. An expanded version of the standards document containing standards for specific languages (e.g. Spanish, Italian) was distributed to each SMC member. In addition, copies of the standards and the guidelines were provided to all other Commission members.

The group was asked to consider what the role of the national standards and the performance guidelines should be within the foreign language framework. Commissioner Abarca indicated that a balance of activities and topics such as practice, conversation, syntax, grammar, and so forth would be important in the framework. She indicated that in the national standards she saw a lot of integration, but not sufficient direct instruction. She indicated that she saw more opportunity for direct instruction within the ACTFL *Performance Guidelines*.

Susan Stickel indicated that the framework should include the best of both worlds in terms of direct instruction of the skills of foreign language and the application and integration of those skills. Leslie Schwarze commented that making clear the role of listening, speaking, reading, and writing would be important in the framework. She confirmed that the foreign language professional community seems to accept the standards and the guidelines as the foundation for foreign language teaching. She also expressed concerns about how broad and general the national standards were, but indicated that she felt that the guidelines were much more helpful. When asked if the SMC members felt comfortable including the standards and the guidelines in the framework, there was agreement. However, precisely how the standards and guidelines would be addressed in the framework was not resolved.

Nancy Brynson distributed copies of the *Massachusetts Foreign Languages Curriculum Framework* to SMC members as an example of how Massachusetts addressed the issue of standards and guidelines. She also distributed copies of e-mail correspondence from Rod Brawley and Kathleen Robinson regarding potential language for the framework for American Sign Language and classical languages (e.g. Latin). Kathleen Robinson had brought the Massachusetts document to Ms. Brynson's attention as an example of how classical languages could be addressed in a framework as well.

## 2. Report on February Meeting

Nancy Brynson verbally summarized the minutes of the February SMC meeting. The SMC members reviewed the written minutes. Leslie Schwarze made one correction in the minutes; the two publishers' representatives at the meeting were McDougall Littell and Harcourt Brace, not Prentice Hall and Harcourt Brace. Susan Stickel moved that the minutes be approved as corrected; Mary Coronado seconded the motion. Commissioners Schwarze, Stickel, and Coronado voted to accept the minutes; Commissioner Abarca abstained.

## 3. Review of Revisions Developed Since February

The group had a lengthy discussion of the framework and revisions. Some committee members indicated that they had received the document too late for a thorough review. Commissioner Abarca indicated that the document was extremely well written and well organized; however, she

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

disagreed with much of it. Mrs. Abarca read notes that Chair Astore had made regarding the document.

Some of the concerns raised by Commissioners Abarca and Astore included problems with national standards, lack of direct instruction, use of an instructional example regarding traditional roles of women, lack of attention to language control, grammar and syntax, citing Steven Krashen, and a number of other specific issues. Vice Chair Coronado felt that in the example regarding Rigoberta Menchu that a discussion of the roles of traditional women was appropriate. Chair Schwarze and Commissioner Stickel offered suggestions for clarifying wording and avoiding generalizations to address any potential concerns. Sherry Griffith raised questions regarding the sequence of various sections of the document and asked how the issue of more complex languages would be addressed. Chair Schwarze commented that adding items to the draft framework, rather than changing them, might address many of the concerns.

Julian Randolph expressed concern regarding the direction of the discussion and stated that if the committee expected him to create both state standards and a framework it would not be possible. He also did not feel that it was reasonable for him to elaborate on all the performance guidelines. He made what he termed two “outrageous” suggestions—that the project be abandoned now or that the Commission asks permission from Massachusetts to adopt their document. He also suggested that the Nebraska framework be consulted. Hal Wingard asked the committee to clarify the issue of direct instruction and how the framework could address such instruction without getting into methods. A lengthy discussion followed regarding the role of instructional methodologies within current frameworks; it was acknowledged that the *Reading/Language Arts Framework* does include instructional strategies.

Julian Randolph commented that the expected student outcomes in the framework indicate the end of the process, but do not tell you how to get there. Commissioner Stickel commented that some teachers might feel that if something is not stated in the framework that they have no responsibility for it anymore. Hal Wingard asked why various issues had not been a part of the initial direction for the development of the framework. Both Commissioners Stickel and Abarca indicated that several of these issues had been raised and that it was not entirely fair to characterize the feedback as “new” news. Mrs. Abarca stated that she had consistently raised the issue of grammar in the original framework development process.

Commissioners not on the Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee asked what criteria or guidelines the framework committee and others had used to develop the framework. The issue of developing frameworks in the absence of State Board of Education approved standards was discussed. Susan Stickel pointed out that the issue is larger than foreign language and has implications for other subjects such as health, physical education, visual and performing arts, and so forth. Veronica Norris indicated that it would be helpful to establish a protocol, since health is faced with a similar problem. Chair Schwarze indicated that the Foreign Language SMC needed to stop and regroup. Patrice Abarca concluded by saying that Julian Randolph had done a wonderful job of revising the document. However, her concern was that she saw the outcomes, but not the road to get there. She indicated that she did not see sufficient specificity or a system; she stated that she did not want to see things embedded in the framework, but spelled out. Hal Wingard stated that he understood what the committee was saying and felt that it could be

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

accomplished. Sherry Griffith stated that it was essential to create a process for frameworks in this circumstance and that in so doing the committee should draw from the templates of other frameworks and staff will bring back suggestions for a process in May.

4. Timeline for Approval of Framework and Consideration of SMC Meeting in April  
Chair Schwarze indicated that, given the level and nature of the concerns regarding the current draft of the framework, the committee would be unable to give direction regarding further revisions. She commented that it was the work of the Subject Matter Committee to consider how to proceed from this point forward. After brief discussion, the group agreed to meet via a conference call in April. The date was to be determined. Before the conference call the SMC members would have time to review the current draft of the framework, to review the standards and guidelines, and to review any documents from other states that might be helpful in the process. Catherine Banker suggested that the issue of developing frameworks in the absence of SBE approved standards be placed on the agenda for the full Commission in May. Vik Hovsepian commented that he assumed that the Foreign Language SMC would bring a recommendation regarding a process to the full Commission.

## B. Update on Adoption Timeline

Nancy Brynson distributed a draft timeline of the upcoming 2003 adoption of foreign language materials. The timeline was provided for information only. The timeline indicated the major adoption events that would be scheduled in order for Board action to occur in October 2003. Ms. Brynson also distributed a draft amendment to Instructional Material Fund expenditure policy that would permit school districts to purchase foreign language materials adopted in 1991 during school years 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03. This draft language will be submitted to the State Board of Education for consideration.

C. Other Matters. With no other matters, the Committee was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

## 2. Full Curriculum Commission Meeting, Friday, March 17, 2000

### Curriculum Commissioners--Present:

Marilyn Astore, Chair  
Catherine Banker  
Viken Hovsepian  
Janet Philibosian  
Leslie Schwarze  
Susan Stickel

Patrice Abarca, Vice Chair  
Mary Coronado Calvario  
Veronica Norris  
Richard Schwartz  
Barbara Smith (present for portions of meeting)  
Karen Yamamoto

### Commissioners--Absent:

Roy Anthony \*  
Lora Griffin \*  
Dede Alpert, Member of the Senate

Ken Dotson \*  
Joseph Nation \*  
Jack Scott, Member of the Assembly

### State Board of Education Liaison—Absent:

Marion Joseph

### California Department of Education Staff:

Sherry Skelly Griffith, Exec. Secretary, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources  
Suzanne Rios, Acting Administrator, CFIR  
Thomas Adams, Consultant, CFIR  
Judith Brown, Consultant, CFIR  
Rona Gordon, Consultant, CFIR  
Kristina Travers, Office Technician, CFIR  
Sandi Adams-Jones, Staff Service Manager I  
Nancy Brynelson, Consultant, CFIR  
Beverly Cole, Office Technician, CFIR  
Deborah Keys, Consultant, CFIR

- L. Call to Order. Commissioner Abarca, Vice Chair, brought the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.  
(Chair Astore rejoined the group shortly thereafter.)

## 6. Library Update –Barbara Jeffus, CDE School Library Consultant

Using the CDE Web site page for school libraries as an outline, Ms. Jeffus provided information on the recent progress of the spring apportionment for the California Public School Library Act and the California Classroom Library Materials Act.

Ms. Jeffus acknowledged to the Commission that determining “who” selects new library resources and determining “what” is selected are challenges for many districts. She provided information about efforts to develop solutions: (1) the new CDE K-12 literature list, anticipated for fall 2000; (2) the potential of improved staffing through proposed legislation, AB 2311; (3) and new data on school library staffing, collections, and programs. Ms. Jeffus encouraged the Commissioners to explore the School Libraries information on the CDE website (cde.ca.gov). Vice Chair Abarca thanked Ms. Jeffus and recessed the full commission at 8:35 a.m.

## 7. Mathematics Subject Matter Committee

Present: Sue Stickel, Chair; Vik Hovsepian, Vice Chair  
Catherine Banker, Veronica Norris, Richard Schwartz, Leslie Schwarze

Absent: Barbara Smith \*

Staff: Suzanne Rios, Acting Administrator, CFIR

Chair Stickel called to order the Mathematics Subject Matter Committee at 8:35 a.m.

### A. Mathematics Framework Errata

\* *Absent for Cause* notification made to Commission Chair

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Chair Sue Stickel referred the SMC members to the Mathematics Framework errata document in their Commission agenda packet. Chair Stickel explained that the errata document to the “Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (1999)” consisted of minor corrections and errors found in a re-review of the framework by Dr. Hung-Hsi Wu of the University of California, Berkeley and Dr. Ralph Raimi of the University of Rochester. Dr. Lily Roberts and Dr. Tom Lester of the CDE staff combined the two lists of corrections submitted by Dr. Wu and Dr. Raimi into a single document----the Errata document. Chair Stickel stated that the document has been sent to all Commissioners and that Chair Astore and Chair Stickel have reviewed it. Furthermore, Chair Stickel explained that the corrections do not change the intent of the mathematics framework, and thus, do not have to go back to the State Board of Education for information/action. Chair Stickel stated that this item was strictly an information item and required no motion for action. Ms. Griffith explained that it was important to make these corrections and proceed with reprinting the framework, as the Los Angeles Unified School District has placed an order for 19,000 mathematics frameworks. Commissioner Schwartz asked if LA Unified would be getting the corrected edition of the framework. Executive Director Griffith assured the SMC that LA Unified has been informed of the situation and that all parties that have purchased the framework will be notified of the mathematics errata. Commissioner Hovsepien asked Chair Stickel if the document was going to be reformatted, and Chair Stickel assured him that the CDE Publications Office would format the document in proper print form. Lastly, Commissioner Schwarze asked that the errata would be put online and Ms. Griffith reassured her that it would be done.

## B. Update on Mathematics Invitation to Submit (ITS) and Timeline

Chair Stickel provided an update on the Mathematics 2001 Invitation to Submit meeting that was held for publishers at the State Library on March 15, 2000. Chair Stickel reported that she and Vice Chair Vik Hovsepien had the opportunity to open the Mathematics 2001 Adoption process and work with the CDE staff on this event. There were 49 representatives from 19 publishers, and 12 more publishers requested that the invitation be mailed to them. With this number of publishers interested in the adoption, it is anticipated that 15 to 20 programs will be submitted.

## C. Update on the IMAP/CRP and Recruitment of Additional IMAP Applicants

In addition, Chair Stickel provided an update on the State Board action regarding the Commission’s recommended list of 12 CRPs and 54 IMAPs. At the March 9th meeting of the State Board in Los Angeles, the Board approved the list and asked that the Commission re-review three applications, numbers 27, 37, and 89 for appointment as a CRP. Moreover, the Board asked that the Commission make a statement of finding for non-appointment as a CRP in this re-review process.

The Mathematics Subject Matter Committee reviewed the three applicants and is recommending to the Board that numbers 37 and 89 be appointed as CRPs. The committee made a statement of finding that number 27 did not meet the criteria for selection as a CRP, since the applicant did not have a doctoral degree in mathematics, which was the criteria for appointment as a CRP.

In addition, Chair Stickel informed the SMC that the Board has requested the Commission to work with the CFIR staff to recruit more CRPs and IMAPs to reflect the diversity of the state and to ensure gender equity and balance. All of the commissioners agreed to assist in the recruitment



# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

effort and to refer applicants to the CFIR office. Commissioner Banker asked if her husband, who is a professional mathematician, could apply to be an IMAP panelist, or if this constituted a conflict of interest. Commissioner Schwartz assured her that this was not the case, since his wife has been appointed as an IMAP panelist for the Mathematics 2001 adoption. The SMC agreed to have a telephone conference call (April 27, 3:15 p.m.) to discuss and review the new applicants and to make recommendations to the Board at their May meeting.

Commissioner Schwarze expressed concern with gaining consensus when IMAP panels consist of 12-15 members. She stated that it is difficult to develop comprehensive, consistent, and accurate reports with this many panelists. Chair Stickel suggested that perhaps having more IMAP panels and fewer members, with seven being the upper limit might provide a strategy to ensure consensus and facilitate the writing of the IMAP reports.

Commissioner Norris asked that the SMC revisit the issue of conflicts of interest with regard to spouses serving on IMAP panels. She requested that legal advisors design a protocol on this issue. Commissioner Banker moved and Commissioner Schwartz seconded, that this issue be brought before the full commission for the development of a policy and procedure regarding spouses who are both professionals, who may want to serve as panelists.

## F. Availability of Curriculum Commission Members for Training and Deliberations *(Order changed)*

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Banker, asking if we had enough commissioners to facilitate the Mathematics 2001 adoption, Chair Stickel moved to Item F on the agenda. Chair Stickel reported to the SMC that the training dates are scheduled for July 31 through August 4, and that the deliberation dates are scheduled for October 15 through October 20. Six commissioners committed to working on this important task (Stickel, Hovsepian, Banker, Norris, Schwartz, and Schwarze). Chair Stickel emphasized that more commissioners would be needed and it was recommended that absent members should be polled on their availability to serve on this adoption.

Commissioner Hovsepian expressed his concern of the need to have commissioners facilitate the IMAP panels, and not to bring persons from the outside unfamiliar with the adoption process in to facilitate. Commissioner Schwarze agreed and expressed the idea that only currently serving commissioners should act as facilitators. Commissioner Banker moved that this policy be recommended to the full commission. In addition, Commissioner Hovsepian proposed that IMAP panels should be increased to a range of 7-9 members and a few alternates, as there are usually dropouts. Also, Chair Astore emphasized that in the development of the statement on absences, the concept of the responsibility of commissioners to serve on at least one adoption per term should be explicitly stated. Furthermore, it was agreed that commissioners who have not participated on an adoption should be encouraged to serve.

Commissioner Banker asked Chair Stickel if they were going to discuss the training process involved in the Mathematics 2001 adoption. Chair Stickel responded that training for CRPs and IMAPs would be discussed in more detail at the May meeting. It was also recommended that the Commission Chair and the SMC Chair be involved in the planning process for the adoption. Chair Stickel assured the SMC that a plan for the CRP/IMAP training and a process for the structure of the CRP and IMAP panels would be on May Commission meeting agenda.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

## E. Review of Candidates for CRP Facilitator

Chair Stickel provided the SMC with a status report on the recruitment for a facilitator to work with the CRPs. In the past, Dr. Tom Lester, a CDE consultant, had successfully filled this role; however, this year Dr. Lester has prior commitments. There is a major mathematics conference at the University of California, Los Angeles, in early August, which conflicts with the scheduled training dates. Chair Stickel asked for suggestions on mathematicians who could act as a facilitator with the CRPs. The potential candidates' qualifications could be reviewed and discussed during the April 27 conference call. Commissioners raised concerns that they were unclear as to the role that a facilitator plays with the CRPs. Chair Stickel asked Commissioner Schwartz to briefly describe the role that Dr. Rollie Otto played in the recent Science 2000 adoption process. In addition, Commissioner Schwarze recommended that the two out-of-state CRPs for the AB 2519 Mathematics adoption in 1999 should be contacted, as they both demonstrated good leadership qualities and were good communicators. Chair Stickel stated that one applicant has already withdrawn from consideration.

Ms. Rios clarified for the SMC members that the facilitator would be compensated for his/her work, as the facilitator would be hired on a short-term contract by the CDE. Commissioner Hovsepian asked if there was a job description for the facilitator role. Executive Director Griffith pointed out to the SMC that there are no statutory provisions that govern the current CRP and IMAP process, as well as, the role of facilitator. She complimented the SMC on their dedication to strengthening the process, and assured Commissioner Hovsepian that contract language for a facilitator would be shared at the May meeting.

Commissioner Astore recommended that Dr. Liping Ma, author of *Knowing and Teaching Elementary Mathematics: Teachers' Understanding of Fundamental Mathematics in China and the United States* (1999), as a good facilitator. A concern was raised that authors of prominent textbooks could have potential conflicts of interest. Moreover, it was agreed that any facilitator needed to be familiar with the standards, the mathematics framework and the adoption process.

## D. Format of IMAP Reports to Reflect Standards, Framework and Criteria

Chair Stickel opened up a lively and productive discussion on the format for the IMAP reports. Commissioner Banker emphasized the need to fine-tune and enhance the training of commissioners, so that the writing of the CRP and IMAP reports is comprehensive, clear, and consistent. Commissioners Hovsepian and Schwartz also shared this view, that the reports need to reflect a consistency between the written report and the recommendations. The reports need to be balanced and written in a manner that is helpful to the various audiences that read them. Commissioner Schwartz reminded the SMC that the reports are public documents that districts use in their decision-making to purchase instructional materials.

## G. Other Matters/Audience Comment

Commissioner Norris and Hovsepian expressed concern with identifying what versions of the IMAP reports the public and publishers were reading. Since these reports are public documents, Commissioners want to ensure that the readers know where they are in the process for public input. The evaluation and adoption process for instructional materials has many opportunities for public input. Ms. Rios offered a proposal to the SMC for identification of the CRP/IMAP

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

report in the adoption process: a cover sheet on each version of the report would state the purpose of the report, phase of the adoption report, next phase with timeline, and the name of the SMC Chair and CFIR contact name for input.

## 8. English Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee

Present: Patrice Abarca, Chair; Janet Philibosian, Vice Chair  
Mary Coronado, Karen Yamamoto, Leslie Schwarze  
Absent: Ken Dotson\*, Lora Griffin\*  
Staff: Deborah Keys, Nancy Brynelson, Consultants;

Commission Abarca, Chair of the ELA/ELD Subject Matter Committee, called the meeting to order at 10:25 a.m. after a brief break in the Commission meeting.

A. Debrief: Publishers' Briefing on the 2002 Reading/English Language Arts Adoption Criteria  
Commissioner Abarca reviewed the February 11, 2000 Publishers' Briefing for those in the audience who were not committee members and for general information that could be useful for future briefing. The Publishers' Briefing was a collaborative presentation by CDE and the English Language Arts Subject Matter Committee. Commissioner Abarca acknowledged all participants: Commissioner Leslie Schwarze, Commissioner Astore, Sherry Griffith, Terry Emmett, Nancy Brynelson, Deborah Keys, Beth Rice, Alice Furry from Sacramento COE, Karen Hayashi, Elk Grove Unified; CFIR Staff: Suzanne Rios, Miquel Cordova, Lino Vincente, Christine Bridges, Sandi Adams, Nancy Plasencia, Beverly Cole and Judi Brown. State Board Representatives: Mrs. Marian Bergeson and Marion Joseph and CFIR Support Staff. She also acknowledged new Commissioners: Laura Griffin, Karen Yamamoto and Mary Coronado.

It was a briefing held for 130 publishers, CDE Staff and other interested folk. There was a brief overview of the Reading/Language Arts Framework, but the main concentration of the day centered on the five categories of the Criteria. The bulk of the presentations were framed around the publishers' pre-submitted questions. As the presenters gave their presentations, they answered additional questions. Commissioner Abarca thanked Sherry Griffith for the suggestion which lead to that format. CFIR staff collected and brought up questions. Presenters answered as many questions as they could; however, some questions just couldn't be answered either because of the lack of specificity or because time would not allow. It was a really full day. Commissioner Abarca thought there was good communication that day but solicited comments from other SMC Commissioners on how to improve the process of the briefing. She asked if the questions answered during the briefing would be available on the web. Deborah Keys, CFIR staff, stated that the questions used to frame the briefing would be kept in a databank in the CFIR office and those questions not answered due to the need for further investigation would be placed on the web at a later date.

Commissioner Abarca opened the floor to other Commissioners to comment on the briefing. Commissioner Yamamoto expressed her excitement in seeing so many publishers attending the briefing. She said she felt like a publisher, given the notetaking she did for herself. She felt the briefing was "perfect," and no improvements were needed. She thanked Commissioner Abarca for allowing her to be a part of the briefing. Commissioner Abarca encouraged the publishers in

\* *Absent for Cause* notification made to Commission Chair

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

the audience to get a copy of all the documents pertaining to the Reading/Language Arts Framework and Criteria. Commissioner Coronado stated that she too was impressed with the briefing and expressed her thanks for being able to attend. She also expressed her praise for the supporting documents that were given to the publishers in a folder at the beginning of the briefing. Commissioner Coronado commended Nancy Brynelson on her knowledge of the Reading/Language Arts Framework. Commissioner Abarca thanked CFIR staff and other Commissioners for making those documents available to the publishers.

## B. CRP/IMAP Application

Commissioner Abarca reviewed with the SMC copies of the 2519 and the Math IMAP/CRP Applications received in their Agenda Packet. She stated that the IMAP/CRP Application for the English Language Arts 2002 Adoption needed to go out in April 2000. Deborah Keys stated (in error) that the application did not have to be disseminated until April 2001. Sherry Griffith, Executive Secretary, suggested that the SMC might look more critically at the application because the 2002 adoption will be quite extensive and unique. She stated that the SMC might want to consider revising the application to reflect the need for emphasis in particular pieces such as the “stand-alone” programs. Also, the SMC may want to consider a revision of the application to reflect the Title 5 Regulations regarding recruitment to reflect the diversity of the state. The SBE revisited this issue, and Legal Counsel had considered putting this back on the application as a voluntary check off. Ms. Griffith felt there was some work that could be done on the application at this time, and the SMC could continue to have discussions at future meetings. Commissioner Abarca thought they would have to work on the application at this meeting and said they could postpone finalizing the application to next month’s meeting. She wanted Commissioners to remember, as they are look over the math application, that it is a good application but need is a lot changed because of the difference between mathematics and language arts. She liked the wording better in the 2519 application. She liked some of the specificity in the 2519 application as opposed to the math application. She said she was looking at it from the lenses of the regular classroom teacher who needs to be encouraged to participate in these adoptions. A regular classroom teacher would look at the application and ask how could they answer certain questions. Commissioner Abarca feels that if they include more specificity and suggestions for things as they are answering questions, for example, referring to the 2519 application, “specialized training in Language Arts”, it would be helpful. One of the sentences she highlighted as an example was, “also please list any membership in professional organizations or associations related to Language Arts”. As a regular classroom teacher answers questions such as these, they may not think to include answers like specific examples like the one mentioned above. She suggested we pull out sentences like this to give suggestions and guidance to teachers and others who may apply. Commissioner Abarca said the SMC should also think about parents and members of the community who would be interested in participation in this process. Also, look at the 2519 application regarding other qualifications, (i.e. please summarize other information and qualification that may be pertinent to your appointment that was not covered above; are you a parent/guardian of children now attending public school). Information like this should be included. Commissioner Abarca requested adding, “do have an expertise in a second/third language(s), scholarly knowledge of another content area like science or history social science”.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Deborah Keys interrupted the discussion to say that she was incorrect in stating the IMAP/CRP Application was to be disseminated in April 2001. The application needed to be disseminated in April 2000. In continuing the review of the applications, Commissioner Abarca suggested that “math” be replaced with “language arts” throughout the math application. On page 2 of the math application, at the top in the background, she wanted it tightened up a bit so it could be a bit smaller to include specific questions about grade level expertise. She thought it was an important point; she thought it should be just simply stated to make it easier. Commissioner Yamamoto thought that particular question could be put on the front where it states employment position or status (cut the long rectangle in half and put years in profession or years at this grade level) because no where does it ask how many years has one been doing a particular profession or job. She stated that this information was on the 2519 application. Commissioner Abarca stated it was on page two of the math application, and if you look at 2519, it is a bit smaller. Commissioner Coronado said she felt it was especially important to find applicants who have diverse experience (i.e. special education, any kind of ELD training, GATE). Commissioner Abarca felt that could be included in the section where it asks for any other qualifications. Commissioner Yamamoto said for housekeeping purposes, she didn’t see any place where it said to print or type. She felt the application needed to say “print or type”. Commissioner Abarca stated that people usually print or type the application; she suggested if it wasn’t on the application to please add it. Deborah Keys stated that she was working with Lino Vincente, CFIR staff, to get the application on the web so people could actually download the application and type right into the boxes.

Ms. Griffith asked the SMC if they would like to go with the same process as the math recruitment and consider requiring a Ph.D. for CRP applicants? She felt it ensured that people would not apply for the position that they were not qualified to do. Commissioner Abarca stated that math and language arts are very different. She said there are people who have a Master in the field of language arts and could be considered experts. She gave the example of her husband who was appointed by Superintendent Delaine Eastin as a member of the Technical Advisory Panel for the High School Exit Exam. She feels the man is a “jewel” when it comes to the Spanish language and his knowledge about education. Commissioner Abarca stated that they should look at the individual when it comes to the CRP for language arts.

Commissioner Schwarze commented that the problem is that everyone has to learn to read to survive life. In the content areas, there are people who become experts in the specific content areas, and it works for history, science, math, but in this particular area it is not the same. She stated that one could see why if one looks at the information received on the assessment report. This report explains that we have a better fit and pretty good information about English language arts on the STAR test because a sample of the population is already doing what is being asked of them to do on the assessment. From this information, you can get decent test numbers. We do not get such numbers in math because we do not have anyone performing at the target level yet. Commissioner Schwarze said language arts is a different animal. She was aware that the information sounds inconsistent. She said she could imagine a Board member asking this question, but this is the one and only content area where we would not ask applicants to have a doctorate because it isn’t clear in what should that doctorate should be. She said she wouldn’t discourage anyone who had a Ph.D. in something, but it is not the same as those content area doctorate degrees. Deborah Keys, CFIR staff, said she agreed that CRP’s should not be required

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

to have a Doctorate, but she suggested that the CRP applicants should have, at least, a Master, and they should specify if it is in one of the sub areas such as reading or Special Ed, as opposed to a Masters in Education with a general subject emphasis. Dr. Keys continued to suggest that the applicants could illustrate how their thesis or focus of study from their graduate degree related to elementary or secondary education. Commissioner Astore added that she hoped the SMC, in examining candidates for the CRP, would really look closely at the activities of those individuals as those activities related to current and confirmed research, to the California Reading Initiative and the legislation that has driven that Initiative, in addition to any work related to the framework. She stated this to build on Dr. Keys' point. Commissioner Astore reminded the commission that California is leading the nation in the area of Reading. Commissioner Astore also hopes that the SMC looks at individuals in the state who have worked very hard and whose activities, in some way, have been connected to the implementation of the Reading Initiative. Commissioner Abarca mentioned that on the 2519 application, there is a box that asks for educational background, perhaps this can be added to that box.

Commissioner Coronado inquired about teachers who have certificates or reading credentials in districts where they are required. Commission Coronado felt that these were true resources. It was stated that Elk Grove Unified School District required reading credentials. Commissioner Coronado questioned whether having a reading credential would be equivalent to having a Master or would it be considered as different.

Commissioner Schwarze referred to the section on the 2519 application, page 4 of 9, that asked for a listing of any recent or specialized training an applicant might have had. This information already existed on the application; she suggested the SMC might want to use it. Commissioner Astore suggested the SMC include for clarity for example, "give references such as: the California Reading Academy, which is a new initiative that was across the state, training by leaders from each of the eleven County Superintendents' regions; the Comprehensive Reading Leadership Training; AB 1086 Trainer". She suggested listing these resources on the application might be helpful. She also suggested the reading certificates could be looked at individually in combination with other district leadership roles. This could be a role needed to be a CRP. Commissioner Abarca referred to page 4 of the math application; number two, "community involvement"; she wanted added, "please describe the community in which you live and work". Also for number three, describe a language arts lesson or activity you use or have used in the classroom; she wanted to add how a teacher would assess the students' learning as it applied to the lesson or activity. Number five of the 2519 application could be an optional question for the CRP/IMAP.

Commissioner Abarca said there should be something added for parents, community members and business people in order to make them feel included. She said she knew there was that feeling when it came to that question about how would you teach a lesson and assess it. As a parent you are teaching all the time. She feels there needs to be a sentence at the start of the application in regards to parents and business people so they will feel welcome to participate as IMAP members.

Executive Secretary, Sherry Griffith asked if the SMC would consider any questions in regards to the intervention components or would that come under the specialized training? Commissioner

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Abarca stated that would come under the specialized training section, under the other qualifications. Commissioner Abarca said perhaps the specialized training should not be an optional piece but should be number five.

Commissioner Abarca thanked the commissioners for doing their homework and for participating in the review of the application.

Commissioner Astore suggested adding a question that asks how the applicants have applied his or her knowledge of the new *Reading/Language Arts Framework* in their position or work. She said they found in past adoptions, that the commission assumed that people knew the framework, but often they did not. This was so in 2519. She stated that standards are the end point; the issue for instructional materials is getting there.

Commissioner Abarca suggested adding Commissioner Astore comments to number three of the math application. Commissioner Abarca suggested changing the reference from the standards to the Reading/Language Arts Framework where appropriate on the application.

Deborah Keys suggested extending the deadline for the IMAP/CRP Application to November 2000 as opposed to October 2000. Commissioner Abarca was concerned with the timeliness of the application. She wanted to know if it would be received in a timely way in order to get the applications to the SBE in a timely fashion. Deborah Keys suggested that it could be done, but the time would be tight. Executive Secretary Griffith stated that the Commission did extend the Math timeline to December 1, 2000, to recruit additional applicants. She suggested that they could wait and see how the recruitment goes and decide after that. Commissioner Abarca commented that the Commission did extend the 2519 IMAP/CRP recruitment.

Commissioner Yamamoto said she was reviewing the application as if she were going to apply and suggested adding or suggestions of anything the applicant might be working on (courses, certificates). Commissioner Abarca agreed that a question like that might be helpful.

Commissioner Astore stipulated to be very specific on the application in reference to which framework, by requesting the exact title and the exact year of the standards.

Commissioner Abarca asks for a motion to accept all the revisions suggested for the application. Deborah Keys suggested allowing staff some time to revise the application and conference with the SMC at a later date for approval. Commissioner Abarca agreed with the request. Commissioner Abarca was concerned with the need for the application to come back to the full commission for approval. She asked if the SMC should ask the full CC for approval. Executive Sherry Griffith said the SMC would need to have the full Commission authorize the SMC to approve the application if they wanted to meet the April 1 deadline. If they wanted to physically come back to the full Commission, they would have to wait until their scheduled meeting in May 18-19. Commissioner Abarca did not want it to wait until June to go to the Board. She wanted to ask for authorization at this SMC meeting.

Friday, March 31, 2000, 4:00 p.m., was set for the SMC phone conference to review and approve the application. Ms. Griffith suggested Commissioner Abarca make a motion to the full

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Commission to authorize the SMC to review and approve the application for the 2002 adoption. It was moved and seconded by Commissioner Yamamoto.

## C. Recommended Literature Reading List

Barbara Jeffus gave a report to the full Commission earlier in the day. Commissioner Abarca commended Barbara for all her hard work. Deborah Keys reiterated that the recommended reading list is available only to those working on the document. A draft will not be available to the public until August/September 2000.

## D. ELA/ELD Criteria Errata

Commissioner Abarca stated that she was pulling lines 98 and 465 from the Errata. These are two items that came up as a result of the Publishers' Briefing. Board Liaison Marion Joseph brought the concern those lines posed to her attention. There was discussion amongst Board Liaison Joseph, Chair Astore, and herself. There had been quite a bit of discussion within the department and the Board Office regarding this Errata policy. The decision was made that if the word "early" were to be added, it would require reopening the Criteria. Commissioner Abarca didn't think it would be a good idea. She felt there shouldn't be a reopening of the Criteria. She stated that it was a surprise to her the day of the Publishers' Briefing when she learned there was an overlap of the intermediate levels. She had not seen it before. She became aware during the presentation of Nancy Brynson. She said she wanted to emphasize that this item had to do with the optional "stand-alone" programs for children in grades four to eight. It is for children who come in with little or no schooling or very limited literacy; it is an optional piece. A key phrase is that it is intensive and accelerated. It is not to be a huge, full blown program that last more than a year. Though the year limitation isn't in the Criteria, it really shouldn't be more than a year; this is the intent.

Commissioner Abarca asked the other members to look at the Errata and asked if there were any questions. Executive Secretary Griffith reminded the SMC that the Board had strongly encouraged the Commission to strongly move forward on an outreach campaign, explaining what the public and the field can expect from this adoption. She said they have an opportunity to educate the public about this aspect as well as the entire Criteria. She stated that the staff, working closely with the Board staff and the Commission, was pursuing this matter. Commissioner Abarca mentioned this matter in her update at the Board meeting in March. Commissioner Abarca asked if there could be some input on the Q & A paper. Executive Secretary Griffith said this is a Board effort so it would need to go through the commission and the department and then go before the Board so they could see what kind of outreach was being conducted. Ms. Griffith said the Errata rests with the Board Office and the SMC could confirm their support of it.

Commissioner Schwarze made a motion and Commissioner Philibosian seconded the motion that the Errata be accepted by the SMC with the deletion of lines 98 and 465. It was confirmed that the Errata had not been shared with the publishers and will now be made public on the web.

## 9. Health Subject Matter Committee (SMC), March 17, 2000

Present: Veronica Norris, Chair; Richard Schwartz

Absent: Roy Anthony\*; Lora Griffin\*.

\* *Absent for Cause* notification made to Commission Chair



# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

CDE Staff: Rona Gordon, Consultant; Caroline Roberts, Admin., Health Services

Commissioner Norris, Chair of the Health Subject Matter Committee called the meeting to order at 11:20 a.m. She thanked Ms. Gordon and Ms. Roberts for their support of the committee.

## A. Update on Health Framework Addendum

Rona Gordon, staff to the Health SMC, provided an annotated list of State Board approved topics, showing individuals working on different sections of the addendum. She stated that staff is in the process of developing a contract with a writer – Hank Resnick, who has much experience in this area, and was the writer of the current Health Framework. Hank will have primary responsibility for developing the asterisked items on the list of topics, and will coordinate and compile the overall document. There should be draft materials to share at the next Commission meeting.

Commissioner Norris raised several questions. Caroline Roberts, Administrator of the School Health Connections Office, clarified that Item #9 will focus more on addressing medical issues that apply to general education rather than special education. Item #17 covers issues that require varying levels of expertise and knowledge (e.g. conflict resolution, suicide prevention). Some are medical issues; some are ‘playground’ issues. Ms. Roberts stated that the number of authors contributing on these topics would provide the appropriate mix. The addendum will describe resources available for content or professional development training. A concern was expressed that some of these issues are not appropriate for classroom curriculum content, but rather matters of referral to appropriate agencies. Commissioner Norris requested that “homeless children” be added to the special populations covered in Item #17. Ms. Gordon responded that she would confer with the appropriate CDE consultant. Chair Astore stated that she was pleased about the asset development piece (Item #2).

## B. Integrating Health Education with Other Curricular Areas

Caroline Roberts provided an overview of this project, which came up at the last Commission meeting. Lessons are in the early developmental stage. The project is based on titles from Recommended Readings in Literature, Grades K-8. Lessons will include reminders about requirements for parental notification and sample parent permission slips. The objective is to develop lessons for middle and high school students that utilize literature selections to reinforce skills, attitudes and behaviors relevant to HIV/AIDS prevention. Resiliency, refusal and conflict management skills are important for students in handling real life situations. The intent is to provide discussion points linked to themes that occur in literature, such as high-risk situations and development of character education qualities and skills we hope students will have. We are trying to reinforce the importance of using literature in different ways, not creating artificial situations or relationships. Ms. Roberts stated that discussion will be useful and comments will help us see how to improve these lessons so that they are appropriate.

Commissioner Norris voiced concerns about the development of an anachronism between current issues and the period in which a piece of literature takes place. She invited other commissioners to comment. Chair Astore expressed the need to be cautious. She emphasized not to try to be interdisciplinary before students grasp the content of the discipline. There is a need to be careful of cross-curricular efforts on a highly sensitive topic. Commissioner Stickel

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

stated that it is very easy to lose the rigor of the standards in this process and urged caution. Commissioner Abarca expressed appreciation for the effort of health professionals to extend into the language arts area. There is a need to have both a strong language arts curriculum and a strong health curriculum, but health lessons cannot necessarily teach language arts. She appreciated Ms. Roberts' sensitivity on this matter. Commissioner Norris stated her concern about the possibility of digressing and losing the literature component. She feels each area is deserving of full and due consideration of its own discipline. She acknowledged that this is a difficult area to work in and thanked the staff for their efforts.

## C. Other Matters/Audience Comment

A representative of the Department of Health Services spoke about the recommendations of the breast-feeding advisory committee. This is an important public health issue. She urged that breast-feeding education be integrated into the K-12 health and nutrition curriculum at appropriate grade levels. Direction was given to confer with Ms. Roberts and Ms. Gordon on how to work with CDE staff.

## 10. History-Social Science (H-SS) Subject Matter Committee

Present: Karen Yamamoto, Janet Philibosian

Absent: Ken Dotson \*, Chair; Roy Anthony\*, Vice Chair; Barbara Smith \*

CFIR Staff: Tom Adams, Consultant, CFIR

### A. Framework Update and CRP Applications

Acting Chair Karen Yamamoto called the meeting to order at 11:43 a.m. She noted the first item of business was the framework review. She stated that the additional recommendations for the Content Review Panel (CRP) were approved by the State Board and asked for staff to update the committee on the process. Dr. Adams stated the draft framework and a cover letter were sent to the Content Review Panel and that CRP comments were due April 18. He summarized the letter by noting that the CRP has the function of reviewing the framework for accuracy and "current and confirmed research." He further noted that the framework had to remain consistent because it was still serving as the basis for the adoption cycle that runs until 2005. Commissioner Yamamoto expressed that she had some concerns about the framework and that she would be reviewing the framework for issues specific to K-3, the space constraints due to class-size reduction and the need for references to books that are in print. Commissioner Yamamoto further noted that the grade 9 elective, "Women in History," needed to be updated. It was agreed that the CRP would examine the course description and present some suggestions. Commissioner Philibosian stated that framework has references that to be more current, especially in the areas of technology. She further noted that Communism was still stated in the present tense when it should be in the past.

Commissioner Yamamoto asked the staff if there were any other areas that need attention. Dr. Adams noted that the Reading-Language Arts Framework includes service learning and the History-Social Science Framework could address this with an additional appendix. Commissioner Yamamoto recognized Mike Brugh, Consultant, of the Family and Community Partnerships Office. Mr. Brugh spoke about the materials submitted to Commissioners and the

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

example of service learning in Los Molinos where students built a local history museum. It was agreed that a draft would be submitted to the Committee for their upcoming meeting.

Commissioner Yamamoto noted that the Committee had much work to do before the next Commission meeting and suggest a teleconference meeting to discuss Content Review Panel input. Commissioner Philibosian agreed. Dr. Adams noted the draft framework would be put up on the web no later than on April 12.

## B. Update on CRP Application

The Committee members reviewed application #13. At the meeting of the Committee on February 23, application #13 had been incomplete. With the application completed, Commissioners Yamamoto and Philibosian expressed their support for the application and hoped the Commission would act to recommend the application to the State Board of Education.

## C. Other Matter/Audience Comment

Commissioner Yamamoto asked for audience comment. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned.

## 11. Electronic Learning Resources (ELR) Committee

Present: Catherine Banker, Chair; Patrice Abarca, Vice Chair  
Mary Coronado, Vik Hovsepian

Absent: Joe Nation\*

CDE Staff: Judith Brown, Consultant, CFIR; Lino Vicente, Office Technician, CFIR  
Dan Holt, Web Team Coordinator, Curriculum and Instructional  
Leadership Branch, CDE

Chair Banker called the ELR committee to order at 12:10 p.m. and thanked the Commission for the support to attend the conference for the Center for Exceptional Children, which will be of interest to the ELR committee as well as the full commission.

## A. Demonstration, CDE Web Site (<http://www.cde.ca.gov>)

Judith Brown, CFIR consultant, introduced Dan Holt and Lino Vicente and their recent work to improve electronic access to the results of the Commissions work. Mr. Holt and Mr. Vicente presented an overview of the organization of the Curriculum and Instructional Leadership web site, including the changes being made to streamline access to the web resources based on Commission work. An array of questions and recommendations were offered by the Commissioners to be carried forward to the web design team.

## B. Education Technology Update

Chair Banker asked that Ms. Sullivan return to give timely information in May, in hopes that greater progress will have been made by then on the advisory committee established by AB 598 and the work of the Statewide Education Technology Services (SETS) established by AB 1761.

## C. Other Matters/Audience Comment.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Commissioner Banker asked for other matters; there were none. She thanked the presenters for the thorough overview of commission-related information on the CDE website and the invitation to provide ongoing feedback or improvements in the web design. Chair Banker adjourned the Electronic Learning Resources committee at 12:50 p.m.

12. **Full Curriculum Commission.** Chair Astore reconvened the Commission at 12:55 p.m. and asked that subcommittee reports be limited to issues requiring action of the full commission.

## A. Reports/Actions from Subcommittees

### 1. Executive Committee.

Chair Astore reported that Executive Committee agreed to establish a work group to develop and to bring forth to the May Commission meeting recommendations regarding the following: (1) the Executive Committee is to study and take action to define what is meant by edits/corrections/changes” within the adoption process; (2) the Executive Committee is to take action to recommend a requirement for errata letters from publishers regarding the notification of errors of fact to go out to consumers of published materials if and when errors are found after an adoption.

Chair Astore also reported that the Executive Committee recommended the final approval of the Commission’s goals for the 1999-2000 term year and post them on the CDE website with the priority work projects listed first. Commissioner Stickel moved to recommend this motion and Commissioner Banker seconded it. All Commissioners said “aye.”

Chair Astore reported that the Executive Committee recommends Commissioner Catherine Banker be appointed to the AB 598 Advisory Committee as the Commission’s non-voting representative. Commissioner Stickel moved and Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. The motion passed with all “ayes.”

Chair Astore reported that the Executive Committee proposed the move of the adoptions for Visual and Performing Arts and History-Social Science to the year 2002 to ensure staff and the Commission are able to support these adoptions. Commissioner Banker so moved; and Commissioner Abarca seconded. All Commissioners said “aye.”

The Executive Committee recommended financial support to Commissioner Banker to attend the Center for Exceptional Children Conference in Canada as the Commission’s representative. Commissioner Stickel made the motion and Commissioner Abarca seconded it. The motion passed; Commissioner Banker abstained.

### 2. Visual and Performing Arts Subject Matter Committee.

Commissioner Yamamoto reported that action needed for the VPA committee had already been taken care of through the motion from the Executive Committee, and approved by the full Commission, to move the VPA follow-up adoption timeline to 2002.

### 3. Science Subject Matter Committee.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Chair Schwartz thanked the CFCC chair, Mike Rios, and the lead writers for their excellent presentation of the draft of the Science Framework.

#### 4. Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee.

Commissioner Schwarze, Chair, reported that the committee had no actions to bring forward.

#### 5. Mathematics Subject Matter Committee.

Commissioner Stickel, Chair of the Mathematics Subject Matter Committee, made the following four separate motions; the second, discussion, and votes are listed with each motion:

Commissioner Stickel moved that the Mathematics SMC recommend the Executive Committee lead a future discussion and the development of a policy concerning conflict of interest when two people of the same household want to be part of the same adoption process. Commissioner Astore seconded the motion; the Commission unanimously approved the motion.

Commissioner Stickel moved that full Commission support the recommendation from the Mathematics SMC to develop an adequate training plan for IMAP report writing to ensure little or no confusion of results for publishers, Commissioners, State Board members, or any others in the future. Commissioner Banker seconded the motion and all Commissioners approved.

The Chair of the Mathematics SMC then moved to recommend that CRP candidates No. 37 and No. 89 be forwarded to the State Board for acceptance as Content Review Panelists.

Commissioner Hovsepian seconded the motion and all Commissioners approved.

Commissioner Norris asked for clarification if the cause of not accepting No. #27 needed to be part of the motion; she was advised that the discussion about criteria, which eliminated 27, would be reported to the SBE as part of the record of the discussion.

Chair Stickel then moved to recommend to the full Commission the agreement that only sitting commissioners be involved as facilitators of Instructional Materials Adoptions Panels (IMAP) in future adoptions. Commissioner Banker seconded the motion; all Commissioners voted “aye.”

#### 6. English Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee.

The ELA/ELD Subject Matter Committee Chair, Commissioner Abarca, reported that the SMC had moved and approved the recommendation to the full Commission to authorize the SMC to finalize the CRP and IMAP application forms during a ELA/ELD Subject Matter Committee conference call March 31 and to forward the application approved during that meeting to the State Board of Education for acceptance. Commissioner Philibosian seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Abarca then moved to forward the ELA/ELD Errata to the SBE for final adoption. Commissioner Philibosian seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted “aye.”

#### 7. Health Subject Matter Committee.

Committee Chair Norris reported no action was needed by the full Commission.

#### 8. History-Social Science Subject Matter Committee.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Commissioner Yamamoto, Vice Chair of History-Social Science, reported that the two members present had not taken action due to a lack of quorum, but wished to offer to the Commission their consensus opinion in favor of CRP applicant No. 13 and to recommend the full Commission send forward the CRP applicant for approved by the State Board of Education. Commissioner Philibosian seconded the motion, and the commission unanimously voted "aye."

## 9. Electronic Learning Resources Subject Matter Committee.

Commissioner Banker reported the committee had voted to forward a request to the State Board of Education to identify and link to the advisory bodies of the Board on the CDE website to ensure easy access to the Commission and other SBE advisory bodies. Commission Hovsepien seconded the motion. The commissioners voted unanimously to forward the recommendation.

## B. Reports from Commission Liaisons.

California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Commissioner Schwarze reported on the mismatch of efforts for teacher development without adequate awareness of the work and products of the Curriculum Commission which support teacher preparation.

Commissioner Schwarze recommended the Commission present to each CTC board member a copy of the frameworks for language arts and mathematics. She also recommended the CTC Board be offered a professional awareness presentation on the adoption criteria and the standards maps used within the adoption deliberations.

Curriculum Instruction Steering Committee (CISC). Chair Astore reported on her work as liaison to CISC sponsored by the county offices of education. She reported appreciation is expressed for her efforts to review the actions of the Commission from the prior meeting.

Concurrence Committee of California Subject Matter Projects (CSMP). Judith Brown reported that Dr. Eleanor Brown would be attending her first meeting in late March due to the cancellation of the previous meeting scheduled for January 28.

## C. Individual Commissioner Reports.

Chair Astore had reported that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) and SBE would be convening a standing advisory group in late March on which Commissioner Coronado has been asked to participate. The group will assist with issues related to English language development policy.

Commissioner Coronado also discussed the forthcoming CABE meeting in which she would participate because of her special background in bilingual education.

Commissioner Smith requested clarification of Commission's adoption process, which may result in the translation of a text to another language and then sold to California schools as an "SBE adopted" text. She requested the Commission consider the need to provide professional development outreach to CABE and other professional groups regarding the work of the Commission and the intent of the adoption criteria for the forthcoming ELA/ELD adoption.

Commissioner Schwartz reported he would be attending a weekend math/science conference.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

## D. Other Matters/Audience Comment.

Chair Astore thanked the Commissioners for their attendance and determination to stay through the end of the meeting in order to participate in final actions of the Commission and to ensure a quorum existed for all votes. Commissioner Abarca requested clarification of what transportation vendors will accept the General Service Charge card for service to/from the airport. Executive Secretary Griffith thanked all of the CFIR staff for their contributions to the work in support of the Commission agenda. No further comments were offered from the audience. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m., March 17, 2000.

---

For further information about these minutes, please contact The Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission (CDSMC) at 916-654-3361 or the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources (CFIR) Division, California Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA, 95814; telephone 916-657-3023; fax 657-5437.

Use the following web site to access up-to-date information about the work of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission and the office of the Curriculum and Instructional Resources Division:  
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/cilbranch/cc>.

Respectfully submitted April 5, 2000: Judith L. Brown, Consultant, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division; phone 916-657-5447; fax 657-5437; e-mail [jbrown@cde.ca.gov](mailto:jbrown@cde.ca.gov).

(Approved by the Curriculum Commission on May 18, 2000, with minor revisions.)

Attached: Minutes from Subject Matter Committee Meetings held outside the regular Commission schedule:

C:\CurriculumCommission\ATTnow\critical\Minutes3-00-fnl with FL.doc; ver5/26/00.

# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee

Conference Call - April 28, 2000, 4:00 p.m. – 5:10 p.m.

MINUTES – Approved by action of Subject Matter Committee and Full Commission May 19, 2000

## Commissioners present:

Leslie Schwarze, Chair

Patrice Abarca

Mary Coronado, Vice-Chair

Susan Stickel (joined the call at 4:45 p.m.)

Commissioners absent: None

## Staff present:

Sherry Skelly Griffith, Director

Arleen Burns, Consultant

Nancy Brynelson, Consultant

## Others present:

Julian Randolph, Contract Writer

Hal Wingard, Executive Director, CLTA

Chair Schwarze started the conference call by stating that the purpose of the call was to consider next steps in the development of the foreign language framework and to comment on documents that Commissioners had not had time to review before the last Commission meeting. Commissioner Abarca stated that the draft framework for foreign language was well written, but that parts of it were missing. Her recommendation was to take the document from where it was and to enhance it; all Commissioners agreed. Both Chair Schwarze and Commissioner Abarca had reviewed the framework from Massachusetts. Leslie Schwarze indicated that she particularly liked the format of the Massachusetts' document on page 31 and how the strands, standards, and entry points were laid out. Patrice Abarca stated that she also liked how it was laid out in some places. Both Chair Schwarze and Commissioner Abarca felt that there were elements from the *Reading/Language Arts Framework* that could be brought into the framework for foreign language, particularly in the areas of systematic instruction and grammar.

There was a general discussion of timelines and the availability of commissioners during the summer to work on the document. Both Chair Schwarze and Commissioner Abarca indicated that they would like to develop some of the sections of the document that they felt were missing. Nancy Brynelson indicated that the last possible date for the State Board of Education to approve the framework and still remain within the timelines for instructional materials was April of 2001. The latest date for Commission approval of the framework, therefore, would be January of 2001. Leslie Schwarze and Patrice Abarca felt that September would be a good target date for the completion of the document. Commissioner Abarca also indicated that she was interested in finding out more about the International Baccalaureate program and the foreign language program in Elk Grove Unified School District.

Sherry Griffith clarified with the commissioners the elements of the *Reading/Language Arts Framework* that they thought were applicable to foreign language. Patrice Abarca indicated that she felt the suggestions for instruction in the *Reading/Language Arts Framework* were most pertinent and that she felt the current draft of the framework for foreign language was much like the 1987 *English-Language Arts Framework* in terms of its generality and approach to direct instruction. Nancy Brynelson suggested that appropriate examples from foreign language should be used to illustrate any elements from the *Reading/Language Arts Framework*; the Commissioners agreed.

There was a discussion of the Advanced Placement program and that it would be useful to examine the AP Teachers Guide. Leslie Schwarze then reiterated that the Subject Matter Committee would look to the *Reading/Language Arts Framework* for specific pieces related to grammar and to the Massachusetts' document for format. Patrice Abarca indicated that she was curious about what Florida and Texas had done. Nancy Brynelson indicated that Arleen Burns had collected a number of documents from other states that the Commissioners could review, although only single copies were available. Commissioners suggested that they would like to review them the day before the May Commission meeting and that if any frameworks were posted on the Internet they would appreciate receiving the appropriate web site addresses.



# Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission

*An advisory body to the California State Board of Education*

MINUTES OF MEETING: March 16-17, 2000 (Approved May 18, 2000)

Since Nancy Brynerson will be unavailable for the May Commission meeting, Arleen Burns and Sherry Griffith agreed to staff the Committee. Nancy Brynerson indicated that Judi Brown had agreed to take minutes for the meeting. The meeting will occur on May 19 and be allotted 1-½ hours. It was agreed that Commissioners would be prepared to offer any additional comments on the current draft of the framework at that time. They would also identify the pieces or components that needed to be added to the document and decide where they should be inserted. There was discussion of a working meeting in Sacramento sometime in May following the Commission meeting, but no decision was made.

At this point in the call, the public was invited to comment. Julian Randolph indicated that it appeared that the Subject Matter Committee (SMC) was the new drafting committee of the document. Chair Schwarze responded that the SMC was simply adding to the draft. Dr. Randolph stated that he was not sure of the distinction. Hal Wingard agreed that it was important to relate the end performance of students to their starting point and that it was possible to give some indication of instructional strategies that work. He stated that the document can and should address aspects of grammar, but with a great deal of sensitivity in terms of how it is interwoven in the document. He indicated that he was concerned about the concept of adding pieces to the framework and that in fact one of the concerns of the CLTA Consensus Committee about the original field review draft had been the lack of integration. He reminded the Commissioners that the students enrolled in IB and AP programs make up only a small percent of the students involved in foreign language. He indicated that the focus should be foreign language study for all students—encouraging all students to participate and extending the sequence for as many as possible—and that the document should address the diversity of the students we have in California.

Nancy Brynerson raised the issue of the treatment of classical languages and indicated that she had received communication from Kathleen Robinson, the president of the classical languages association in Southern California. Ms. Brynerson stated that Ms. Robinson had agreed to help with any language related to classical languages in the framework. Susan Stickel commented that the group had not outlined completely the role of a framework that is not based on state-approved standards. Sherry Griffith stated that there seemed to be agreement that all frameworks needed to indicate grade-level expectations. However, she indicated that there was insufficient staffing to support a larger discussion and development of the issue at this time. Susan Stickel indicated that she understood and commented that in the absence of state-approved standards that there didn't seem to be much meat to the framework. She suggested that the group look to the research about instruction cited in the *Mathematics Framework*. She stated that she didn't disagree with the national standards for foreign language, but that she was not sure how to play the performance guidelines off the national standards.

Sherry Griffith stated that the SMC would need to revise its timeline for the development of the framework. There was some discussion about approaching the State Board of Education for clarification of their position relative to the national standards, but no decision was made. Nancy Brynerson indicated that the criteria chapter for instructional materials still remained to be addressed. Chair Schwarze asked if staff could check to see what criteria Massachusetts had for instructional materials.

It was agreed that the May SMC agenda would center on the framework and that the following points would be addressed:

- Timeline
- Additional feedback on the current draft, as appropriate
- Other frameworks and resources
- Identification of what and where to add specific elements to the current draft
- Criteria for instructional materials

The Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee conference call was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

(These Foreign Language SMC minutes were approved May 19, 2000)